

**MINUTES**  
**MAG REGIONAL CONCEPT OF TRANSPORTATION OPERATIONS**  
**STAKEHOLDER GROUP MEETING No. 5**

**January 8, 2003**  
**10:30 AM - 12:00 PM**  
**Maricopa Association of Governments**  
**302 N First Avenue, Suite 300**  
**Phoenix, Arizona**

ATTENDANCE

Mary Kihl, ASU  
Bruce Dressell, City of Scottsdale  
Meifu Wang, FHWA  
Alan Hansen, FHWA  
Sarath Joshua, MAG  
Xiao Qin, MAG

Jimmie Dixon, City of Glendale  
Scott Nodes, City of Peoria  
Bruce Ward, Town of Gilbert  
Bob Maki, City of Surprise  
Mike Mah, City of Chandler  
Tim Wolfe, ADOT  
Bob Ciotti, Phoenix Public Transit

PROJECT TEAM MEMBERS PRESENT

Pierre Pretorius, Kimley-Horn & Associates  
Chris Jordan, Kimley-Horn & Associates  
Brent Crowther, Kimley-Horn & Associates

MINUTES

1. Project Introduction and Welcome, Project Schedule, and Previous Meeting Minutes

Pierre Pretorius informed the group that the project is on schedule. He then asked for comments on the notes of the December meeting. None were received. The minutes were approved. Notes are available on the project website (<http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/project.cms?item=1395>).

2. Discussion Items

**Distribution of Tech Memo No. 2:** Comments were received and have been incorporated into the TM No. 2 (Final). TM No. 2 (Final) will be distributed at the February Stakeholders Group Meeting. An electronic version will be posted on the project website as soon as it is available.

**Presentation of Draft TM No. 3:** The performance measures have been down-selected over the past few months to include a “few, good, measures.”

The Freeway Mobility performance measure consists of travel speed and travel time by freeway segment. The 3-year and 5-year goals are to limit the change in average travel speed/travel time to 10% less than the growth in traffic volumes. The committee was asked to comment on this goal, and provide feedback on whether this is an attainable goal. Another alternative is to measure the variability in travel speeds/travel time, providing a measure of reliability, in lieu of mobility.

The Arterial Mobility performance measure consists of:

- Peak/non-peak period average travel speed/travel time by arterial
- Percentage of traffic signals coordinated in cities
- Percentage of cross-border traffic signals coordinated between cities

The question was raised whether these performance measures should apply to all arterials in the MAG Region, or should they apply to only select smart corridors. Is 100% of arterials, or 100% of smart corridors, an achievable goal?

Tim Wolfe suggested that the goals outlined in the memo may not be consistent with projects programmed within the next 3 years, or 5 years. Funding constraints may make the goals unattainable.

The suggestion was made that these goals may provide an impetus for increased funding. Do the stakeholders feel that the presentation of these goals may present a mechanism to attain increased funds?

Mike Mah suggested that along with the goals, an estimate of how many man-hours it may take to achieve the goals should be developed. For example, how many man-hours would it take to coordinate all of the signals within the City of Mesa? This will be done during the task on resources required to implement the RCTO.

Meifu Wang pointed out that the proposed goals appear to be consistent with the goals of improved travel time set that have been set at the national level.

Sarath Joshua emphasized that the goals need to be realistic. Each agency needs to consider whether the proposed goals can/can not be achieved. In three years time, each agency will take a look back, and make a determination of whether or not the goals were achieved.

Tim Wolfe suggested that, in order to make a determination of whether the goals are achievable, baseline information would be useful. He suggested that an email be sent to each agency, requesting information concerning the number of miles of smart corridors that within each city, and what percentage of signals are on a coordinated system.

Sarath Joshua stated that MAG informed the Vision 21 Task Force that 84% of all signals in the region were defined as coordinated. Pierre Pretorius mentioned that we should recognize that isolated signals exist that don't warrant coordination. He also noted that the proposed goals can be debated, and should be modified dependent upon the estimated costs.

Tim Wolfe asked if time-based coordination would qualify as being coordinated. Pierre Pretorius answered in the affirmative, and noted that the 84% cited in the Vision 21 report includes closed loop, time based, and central loop systems.

Bruce Dressell emphasized that arterial travel time can only be improved with better coordination and optimization of traffic signals.

The stakeholder group should provide comments on the proposed performance measures, and provide comments to Sarath, or using the yahoo email discussion group.

Another key performance measure relates to maintenance and reliability. Sarath Joshua requested that the cities pay particular attention to this, and provide input as to what goals may not only be

attainable, but what goals are necessary. For example, is 99.5% of system up-time really necessary?

With respect to maintenance and reliability, Bruce Dressel noted that when a communication failure occurs, it might take Qwest three days to repair. This is beyond the city's control.

Sarath Joshua noted that we don't want to define a new set of record keeping activities. The objective is to build upon existing record keeping activities.

Mike Mah said that Icons automatically keeps track of system up-time, etc. However, he also noted that the maximum up-time, when everything works perfectly, is 99%. Background noise accounts for the 1%. Thus, 99.5% is not only unnecessary, but also unachievable.

Likewise, ADOT's current goal of system uptime is 95%. The group should consider peak periods, holidays, and weekends, and evaluate how much uptime is critical to the system.

**Policies in TM No. 4:** Pierre Pretorius presented an overview of the contents of TM No. 4: Policies and Practices Needed to Achieve Operational Goals.

TM No. 4 contains 'operational story-line concepts' for Regional Traffic Management, Local Traffic Management, Transit Management, and Emergency Services.

Tim Wolfe asked if the County and State Emergency Operations Centers should be included. Pierre Pretorius responded that they should be included.

The group is asked to review the TM No. 4 (Outline) and provide comments.

### 3. Next Meeting

The next Stakeholders Group Meeting will include a workshop to discuss the proposed policies and practices. This will be held on February 5, 2003. The workshop will be held from 10:30 to 1:00 p.m. Lunch will be provided.

A visit and tour of the Scottsdale TMC has been planned for January 24<sup>th</sup>. This visit will be in conjunction with the Phoenix Open.

### 4. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.